

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Darrell L. Goss, #305517,)	
)	C.A. No. 2:21-558-HMH-MGB
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	OPINION & ORDER
)	
Ryshema Davis, <i>Nutritionist</i> ; Betty Smith,)	
<i>Food Service Branch Chief</i> ; Ann Sheppard,)	
<i>Associate Warden</i> ; Mr. Gore, <i>Food Service</i>)	
<i>Director</i> ; South Carolina Department of)	
Corrections,)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2006).

The Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198,

199 (4th Cir. 1983). The court must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Baker’s Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein. It is therefore

ORDERED that Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 19) is granted in part and denied in part. Plaintiff’s § 1983 claims against SCDC are dismissed in their entirety and SCDC is dismissed from this action. Plaintiff’s § 1983 claims for monetary damages against the individual Defendants in their official capacities are dismissed; Plaintiff’s § 1983 claims for injunctive relief against Defendants Davis, Smith, and Sheppard are dismissed.

This action is remanded to the magistrate judge for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
July 27, 2021

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.